

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-15 are pending in the application, with 1, 8, and 15 being the independent claims. By this Amendment, Applicant seeks to amend claims 1, 8, and 15. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Unless otherwise indicated, the claim amendments are for purposes of clarity and not to overcome any specific rejection within the Office Action.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jain et al. (U.S. Patent 6,312,134). Applicant traverses this because the cited reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention.

For example, the cited reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a method and system for printing a pattern on a photosensitive surface including alternately activating the pixels within pixel pairs such that only one of the pixels is used to produce the pattern, the pattern being representative of an oscillating stitching line, as recited in claims 1, 8, and 15.

If a future Office Action rejects claims 1, 8, and 15, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Official Action specifically point out in the cited reference a method and system for printing a pattern on a photosensitive surface including alternately activating

the pixels within each pair such that only one of the pixels is used to produce the pattern, the pattern being representative of an oscillating stitching line.

It is respectfully pointed out that anticipation can only be established by a single prior art reference that discloses each and every element of the claimed invention. RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Systems, Inc., 730 F.2d 1440 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Therefore, since the cited reference fails to recite each and every element of Applicant's invention as required in claims 1, 8, and 15, claims 1, 8, and 15 are not anticipated by the cited reference and are therefore allowable.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and claims 9-14 depend from claim 8. Therefore, claims 2-7 and 9-14 are allowable, at least for the reasons claims 1 and 8 are allowable, and for the specific features recited therein.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Theodore A. Wood  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 52,374

Date: May 3, 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

365489\_1.DOC